



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/537,858	03/28/2000	Paul Proost	49674	5522
21874	7590	01/15/2004	EXAMINER	
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP			ROARK, JESSICA H	
P.O. BOX 9169			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02209			1644	

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/537,858	PROOST ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jessica H. Roark	<b>Art Unit</b> 1644	
<b>All Participants:</b>  (1) <u>Jessica H. Roark</u> . (2) <u>Dianne Rees</u> .	<b>Status of Application:</b> _____  (3) _____. (4) _____.  <b>Date of Interview:</b> <u>12 January 2004</u> <b>Time:</b> _____		
<b>Type of Interview:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)			
<b>Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, provide a brief description:			
<b>Part I.</b> <b>Rejection(s) discussed:</b> <i>none</i>			
<b>Claims discussed:</b> <i>24-30</i>			
<b>Prior art documents discussed:</b> <i>none</i>			
<b>Part II.</b> <b>SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:</b> <i>See Continuation Sheet</i>			
<b>Part III.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part I above.			
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)		(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's comments in the Response filed 10/2/03 suggest that the Office had inadvertently examined the wrong claim set in the Office Action of 3/31/03. Applicant provided the text of claim 24 as Applicant believed the claim was filed in the Amendment of 1/21/03. The text of the claim 24 presented in the Remarks filed 10/2/03 does not correspond to the text of any claim pending before the Examiner. It is noted that the Claim set received 1/21/03 appears to have been a duplicate submission of the claims filed in the proposed after final amendment received 7/25/02.

To address this discrepancy, the Examiner requested that Applicant submit a new set of claims.

Applicant agreed.